



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/606,093	06/27/2000	Rasiklal Punjalal Shah	RD-27,075/USA	4082

6147 7590 07/14/2003

GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY  
GLOBAL RESEARCH CENTER  
PATENT DOCKET RM. 4A59  
PO BOX 8, BLDG. K-1 ROSS  
NISKAYUNA, NY 12309

EXAMINER

PARDO, THUY N

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2175

DATE MAILED: 07/14/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/606,093	06/27/2000	Rasiklal Punjalal Shah	RD-27,075/USA	4082

6147 7590 06/18/2003

GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY  
GLOBAL RESEARCH CENTER  
PATENT DOCKET RM. 4A59  
PO BOX 8, BLDG. K-1 ROSS  
NISKAYUNA, NY 12309

EXAMINER

PARDO, THUY N

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2175

DATE MAILED: 06/18/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

213

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/606,093

Applicant(s)

SHAH ET AL.

Examiner

Thuy Pardo

Art Unit

2175

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 March 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-66 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-66 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

DIANE D. MIZRAHI  
PRIMARY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 10. 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's Request for Reconsideration filed on March 25, 2003 in response to Examiner's Office Action has been reviewed.

2. Claims 1-66 are presented for examination.

#### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over **Beall et al.** (Hereinafter "Beall") US Patent No. 6,484,165, in view of **Wong et al.** (Hereinafter "Wong") US Patent No. 5,890,175.

As to claim 1, Beall teaches the invention substantially as claimed, comprising:

obtaining a reference material search request [product search "bic pen red" entered by the user, 300 of fig. 3; 503 of fig. 5; the abstract].

providing a list of at least one cataloged item [a list of categories from each of matching products is dynamically compiled and displayed to the user, see the abstract]; and

providing a copy of the at least one reference material associated with the at least one cataloged item [a list of requested cataloged items is printed by the end user, 302 of fig. 3; col. 7, lines 66 to col. 8, lines 3].

However, Beall does not explicitly teach that the requested item is associated with at least one reference material relating to at least one of training of field service personnel and field service of machines. Wong teaches that the requested item is associated with at least one reference material relating to at least one of training of field service personnel and field service of machines [online transaction processing is not only applied in small users but also applied in acquisition, personnel, training, and support, see col. 1, lines 26-41].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to have modified the communication service system of Beall wherein the requested items provided thereof would have incorporated the teachings of Wong especially the use of training and supporting work-related tasks. The motivation being to expand and enhance the versatility of Beall's system by providing an infrastructure for wide availability for a particular enterprise [see Wong, col. 1, lines 31-36].

As to claims 2, 3, Beall and Wong teach the invention substantially as claimed. Beall further teaches that the reference material search request comprises data relating to at least one of a data relating to a machine [product information, fig. 3-4; col. 4, lines 29-41], data relating to a skill level [col. 1, lines 26-28], data relating to a service task [product descriptions, manufacturers, and parametric values, 503 of fig. 5], and a keyword [col. 1, lines 67 to col. 2, lines 16].

As to claim 4, Beall and Wong teach the invention substantially as claimed. Wong further teaches that the data relating to the machine comprises data relating to product type and model [size, color, model...etc, see col. 8, lines 45-47], data relating to at least one of novice and expert, and data relating to at least one of installation, maintenance and modification [inherent in the product information from suppliers, col. 4, lines 35-36].

As to claim 5, Beall and Wong teach the invention substantially as claimed. Beall further teaches that the providing the list comprises generating the list from a data storage unit comprising a plurality of cataloged items regarding a plurality of different machine types [see cataloged items in fig. 3-4].

As to claim 6, Beall and Wong teach the invention substantially as claimed. Wong further teaches that teaches that the providing the list comprises generating the list from a data storage unit comprising a plurality of cataloged items based on an authorization level [col. 4, lines 54-56].

As to claims 7-8, all limitations of these claims are rejected in the analysis in claims 3 and 6 above, and these claims are rejected on that basis.

As to claim 9, it is similar to claim 4; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale.

As to claim 10, Beall and Wong teach the invention substantially as claimed. Wong further teaches that the providing the copy comprises retrieving the copy from a data storage unit comprising data relating to at least one of training manuals and service manuals [inherent in product information, 20 of fig. 2].

The elements of claims 11-20 are rejected in the analysis as specified in claims 1-10 above, and these claims are rejected on that basis.

As to claim 21, Beall and Wong teach the invention substantially as claimed, with the exception that the second computing unit is a hand held computer. An official notice is taken that this feature is well known in the art, and well-applied in a data retrieval system. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to apply this feature in the system in order to allow a greater flexibility in a search system.

As to claim 22, Beall and Wong teach the invention substantially as claimed. Beall further teaches that the communications network is a global computer network [web-based information retrieval system, see fig. 1].

Claims 23-44 are corresponding apparatus claims of claims 1-22; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale.

As to claim 45-54, they are similar to claims 1-10; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale.

Claims 55-66 are corresponding apparatus claims of claims 1-22 and 45-54; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale.

### ***Response to Arguments***

5. (A) Applicant argues that Wong does not teach or suggest a requested item that is associated with at least one of training of field service personnel and field service of machines.

As to point (A), Examiner respectfully disagrees. Examiner believes that this feature was also taught by Wong. Wong teaches that the system is not only applied in selling goods online but also in training, personnel, and support, again beyond the means of small users [see col. 1, lines 37-41].

(B) Applicant argues that no motivation has been provided to combine the Beall and Wong references.

As to point (B), Examiner respectfully disagrees. The examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.d. 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.d. 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the communication service system of Beall wherein the requested items provided thereof would have incorporated the teachings of Wong especially the



use of training and supporting work-related tasks. The motivation being to expand and enhance the versatility of Beall's system by providing an infrastructure for wide availability for a particular enterprise [see Wong, col. 1, lines 31-36].

6. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive.

### ***Conclusion***

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a).

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE TO THIS FINAL ACTION IS SET TO EXPIRE THREE MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS ACTION. IN THE EVENT A FIRST RESPONSE IS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION AND THE ADVISORY ACTION IS NOT MAILED UNTIL AFTER THE END OF THE THREE-MONTH SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD, THEN THE SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD WILL EXPIRE ON THE DATE THE ADVISORY ACTION IS MAILED, AND ANY EXTENSION FEE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) WILL BE CALCULATED FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THE ADVISORY ACTION. IN NO EVENT WILL THE STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE EXPIRE LATER THAN SIX MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thuy Pardo, whose telephone number is (703) 305-1091. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Thursday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dov Popovici, can be reached at (703) 305-3830.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

(703) 746-7238	(After Final Communication)
(703) 746-7239	(Official Communication)
(703) 746-7240	(For Status inquiries, draft communication)

and/or:

(703) 746-5616 (*Use this Fax#, only after approval by Examiner, for "INFORMAL" or "Draft" communication. Examiner may request that a formal/amendment be faxed directly to then on occasions*).

Any inquiry of a general nature of relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

**9. Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

**or faxed to:**

(703) 308-9051, (for formal communications intended for entry)

**Or:**

Application/Control Number: 09/606,093  
Art Unit: 2175


Page 9

(703) 308-5359, (for informal or draft communications, please label

"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington.

VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).



Thuy Pardo  
June 04, 2003

DIANE D. MZRAHI  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2175